

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 6296 of 2000

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE Y.B.BHATT

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed : YES
to see the judgements?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy : NO
of the judgement?
 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question : NO
of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution
of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned : NO
Magistrate/Magistrates, Judge/Judges, Tribunal/Tribunals?

ABDULKARIM IBRAHIM VOHRA

Versus

GUJARAT ELECTRICITY BOARD

Appearance:

MR TR MISHRA for Petitioner No. 1-5
MR MD PANDYA for Respondent No. 1,2-3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE Y.B.BHATT

Date of decision: 17/09/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties. On a joint request, this matter is taken up for final hearing today.
2. The petitioners herein have challenged their

transfer, so far as petitioners No. 2 to 5 are concerned, from Ukai Thermal Power Station, whereas the petitioner No.1 has challenged his transfer from Gandhinagar Thermal Power Station to Ukai Thermal Power Station.

3. During the pendency of the present petition, subsequent developments have taken place, whereby the petitioners No. 2 to 5 have been re-posted back to Ukai Thermal Power Station. Therefore, no grievance on their part would now survive.

3.1 So far as petitioner No. 1 is concerned, he has been able to work out an acceptable solution, and, by his letter dated 29th July 2002 addressed to the Board, has expressed his willingness to accept the transfer by promotion to Superintendent of Accounts at Vanakbori Thermal Power Station or Dhuvaran Thermal Power Station. Factually, he has been promoted and posted at the latter station. Thus, even his grievance made in the petition would not survive.

3.2 The aforesaid developments have been conveyed to the Court by Mr. M.D. Pandya supported by the documents in question, which are taken on record.

4. In the light of the aforesaid developments, the grievance made by the petitioners no longer survive, and consequently the petition does not require any further consideration. Consequently, rule is discharged, with no orders as to costs.

(Y.B. BHATT, J.)
mathew